UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,443	07/24/2003	Michael Hogan	2002P12271US01	9636

7590   06/18/2008

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
COUGHLAN, PETER D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/626,443	HOGAN, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	PETER COUGHLAN	2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 May 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claim(s) <u>45</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 July 2003</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date '<u>A</u>'.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   This office action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered May 30, 2008 for

the patent application 10/626443 filed on July 24, 2003.

2.   All previous office actions are fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by

reference.

3.   Examiner's Comment: Although, the terms 'carrier wave' or 'carrier signal' is not

specifically mentioned within the specification, the Examiner will exclude these

interpretations wherein the context of 'storing data', 'database' is disclosed.

Status of Claims

4.   Claims 1-45 are pending.

5.   Claim 45 is restricted due to claims 1-44 pertain to a batch process and

configuration information of pharmaceuticals which claim 45 pertains to the fast food

restaurant industry, classification 705/26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form
the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
     A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under
section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent,
except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application
filed in the United States only if the international application designated the
United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English
language.

Claims 1, 20, 43, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) (hereinafter referred to

as Deitz) being anticipated by **Deitz**, U.S. Patent 7020876.

Claim 1

Deitz teaches obtaining configuration information from a computer based

validated biopharmaceutical batch process control system (**Deitz,** C5:17-46;

'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch

oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that

produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz.); based upon a detected hierarchy among elements

of the configuration information automatically obtaining a first transformed version of the

configuration (**Deitz,** C4:9-32; 'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of

applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a set of batch

information in response to the first message requesting ... using a graphical user

interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of batch

information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of batch

information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of Deitz.);

transforming the first transformed version of the configuration information using user

input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz,** Fig.

9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10; 'First transformed version of the configuration

information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration

information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of Deitz.) the user input obtained via a

graphical user interface the user input indicative that DHTML logic is to be applied to

obtain the second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz,** C1:36-50,

C16:46-54; 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the classical definition of

'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages which enable web

pages to be dynamic. Thus since Deitz is able to be edited and be used over the

internet, then DHTML is inherent.) expressing the first transformed version and the

second transformed version in a destination biopharmaceutical batch process control

system, the biopharmaceutical batch process control system configured by the second

transformed version to control a biopharmaceutical batch process. (**Deitz,** C8:28-55;

'Expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is

disclosed by the ability to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz.)

Claim 20

Deitz teaches receiving input relating to an element of the information from a

user. (**Deitz,** C8:28-55; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical

user interface' of Deitz.))

Claim 43

Deitz teaches obtaining configuration information from a computer based

validated biopharmaceutical batch process system (**Deitz,** C5:17-46;

'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch

oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that

produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz.); based upon a detected hierarchy among elements

of the configuration information automatically obtaining a first transformed version of the

configuration (**Deitz,** C4:9-32; 'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of

applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a set of batch

information in response to the first message requesting … using a graphical user

interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of batch

information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of batch

information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of Deitz.);

transforming the first transformed version of the configuration information using user

input to obtain a second transformed version of the information (**Deitz,** Fig. 9, C5:7-9,

C13:49 through C14:10; 'First transformed version of the configuration information using

user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information' of

applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of Deitz.), the user input obtained via a graphical user

interface the user input indicative that DHTML logic is to be applied to obtain the second

transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz,** C1:36-50, C16:46-54;

'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the classical definition of 'logic.' DMTHL

is a combination of a number computer languages which enable web pages to be

dynamic. Thus since Deitz is able to be edited and be used over the internet, then

DHTML is inherent.) ; and expressing the first transformed version and the second

transformed version in a destination biopharmaceutical process control system, the

biopharmaceutical process control system configured by the second transform version

to control a biopharmaceutical process. (**Deitz,** C8:28-55; 'Expressing the first

transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is disclosed by the ability

to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz.)

Claim 44

Deitz teaches means for obtaining configuration information from computer

based validated biopharmaceutical batch process control system (**Deitz,** C5:17-46;

'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch

oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that

produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz.); means for automatically obtaining based upon a

detected hierarchy among elements of the configuration information a first transformed

version of the configuration information (**Deitz,** C4:9-32; 'Hierarchy among elements of

the configuration' of applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a

set of batch information in response to the first message requesting … using a graphical

user interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of

batch information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of

batch information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of

Deitz.); means for transforming the first transformed version of the configuration

information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration

information (**Deitz,** Fig. 9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10; 'First transformed version of

the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of

the configuration information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of Deitz.), the user

input obtained via a graphical user interface the user input indicative of a predetermined

option regarding the second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz,**

C1:36-50, C16:46-54; 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the classical

definition of 'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages which

enable web pages to be dynamic. Thus since Deitz is able to be edited and be used

over the internet, then DHTML is inherent.); and means for expressing the first

transformed version and the second transformed version in a process control

destination system, the process control destination system configured by the second

transform version to control a process. (**Deitz,** C8:28-55; 'Expressing the first

transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is disclosed by the ability

to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz

as set forth above, in view of Jarett. (U. S. Patent 6195665, referred to as **Jarett**)

Claim 45

Deitz teaches obtaining information from one or more sources(**Deitz,** ¶0010;

'Obtaining information from one or more sources' of applicant is equivalent to 'original

conceptual design parameters' of Deitz.); applying a first plurality of pattern matching

rules to at least a first portion of the information to obtain a first transformed version of

the information, the first plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge

about a first plurality of patterns in the information (**Deitz,** ¶0010; 'First plurality of

pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to 'scale calculations for each of the

unit operations' of Deitz.); transforming at least a second portion of the information

using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the information (**Deitz,**

¶0010; 'Second transformed version of information' of applicant is disclosed by

producing information needed to 'produce the desired amount of product per batch.),

the user input obtained via a graphical user interface generated based on a second

plurality of pattern matching rules, the second plurality of pattern matching rules based

on expert knowledge about a second plurality of patterns in the information. (**Deitz,**

¶0287, ¶0010; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'interface' of Deitz.

'Second plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is the resulting output of the

'scale calculations' of Deitz.)

Deitz does not teach expressing the first transformed version and the second

transformed version in a fast food restaurant information management destination

system, the fast food restaurant information management system configured by the

second transformed version to control information transfers in the fast food restaurant.

Jarett teaches expressing the first transformed version and the second

transformed version in a fast food restaurant information management destination

system, the fast food restaurant information management system configured by the

second transformed version to control information transfers in the fast food restaurant.

(**Jarett,** C5:12-58; Transformation of information regarding 'fast food restaurant

information management destination system' of applicant is disclosed by the example of

'the fast food or trucking industry might use industry data' for comparison. Jarett

illustrates a company within a company using fast food and trucking and the use of

templates.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by employing the invention

in the fast food industry as taught by Jarett to have express the first transformed version

and the second transformed version in a fast food restaurant information management

destination system, the fast food restaurant information management system configured

by the second transformed version to control information transfers in the fast food

restaurant.

For the purpose of illustrating the flexibility of the invention such that it can be

used in other domains besides biopharmaceutical process batch manufacture.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

Claims 2-4, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Jayaram. (U. S. Patent

6996589, referred to as **Jayaram**)

Claim 2

Deitz does not teach converting the information into a common format.

Jayaram teaches converting the information into a common format. (**Jayaram,**

C11:15-55; One example of a 'common format' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram.) It

would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using a consistence format as

taught by Jayaram to converting the information into a common format.

For the purpose of avoiding additional computing cost associated with two or

more formats.

Claim 3

Deitz does not teach converting the information into a user-definable syntax.

Jayaram teaches converting the information into a user-definable syntax.

(**Jayaram,** C11:15-55; 'User definable syntax' of applicant is equivalent to 'configurable

mapping language' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Deitz by altering information into a user familiar syntax as taught by Jayaram to

converting the information into a user-definable syntax.

For the purpose of having the invention easier to use for the user due to the fact

the user defines syntax is employed.

Claim 4

Deitz does not teach converting the information into XML.

Jayaram teaches converting the information into XML. (**Jayaram,** C11:15-55;

One example of a 'XML' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious

to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify

the teachings of Deitz by using XML as taught by Jayaram to converting the information

into XML.

For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of implementation

across multiple platforms.

Claim 8

Deitz does not teach expressing the information in an XML syntax.

Jayaram teaches expressing the information in an XML syntax. (**Jayaram,**

C11:15-55; One example of a 'XML' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram.) It would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using XML taught by Jayaram to

expressing the information in an XML syntax.

For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of expression

across multiple platforms.

Claim 12

Deitz does not teach generating a plurality of options adapted for use in

translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches generating a plurality of options adapted for use in translation

of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Options' of applicant is

equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Deitz by having options as taught by Jayaram to generating a plurality of options

adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of being able to generate options for obtaining different

translations as needed.

Claim 14

Deitz does not teach creating graphical user interface elements adapted to

present a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches creating graphical user interface elements adapted to present a

plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47;

'Options' of applicant is equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram. 'Graphical user interface'
of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Jayaram. Jayaram illustrates that instructions may
be entered by the GUI.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in
the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by being able
to view the options as taught by Jayaram to creating graphical user interface elements
adapted to present a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

For the purpose of being able to view the possible options to use for translation
functions.

Claim 15

Deitz does not teach presenting a plurality of options adapted for use in
translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches presenting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation
of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Presenting a plurality of options
of applicant is equivalent to 'constructs in a selectable list' of Jayaram.) It would have
been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's
invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by displaying the options as taught by
Jayaram to presenting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element
of the information.

For the purpose of being able to employ the possible options to use for
translation functions.

Claim 18

Deitz does not teach presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of

options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of options

adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47;

'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Jayaram.) It would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by combining the GUI and the generated

options as taught by Jayaram to presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of

options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of reducing the effort to employ the options by using a GUI.

Claim 19

Deitz does not teach receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options

adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options

adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47;

'Translating an element of the information' of applicant is equivalent to 'the GUI may

further include a mapping language parser to ensure that any mapping dependency

constraints are fulfilled' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Deitz by being able to accept input as taught by Jayaram to receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of having the invention take in input from the user so that the user can chose which translation options are desired.

Claim 23

Deitz does not teach tracking received user input adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches tracking received user input adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C21:34-52; 'Tracking' of applicant is equivalent to 'tracking are published' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by keeping a log as taught by Jayaram to tracking received user input adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of aiding the user by avoiding duplicate translation request.

Claim 24

Deitz does not teach providing an audit trail of the user input relating to a translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches providing an audit trail of the user input relating to a translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C21:34-52; 'Providing an audit trail' of applicant is equivalent to 'tracking are published' of Jayaram. This is due to the specification 'user input can be tracked, thereby providing an audit trial of user input.') It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having audit trail generated as taught by Jayaram to providing an audit trail of the user input relating to a translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of keeping track of the cost for the translations of the invention for possible display to the user.

Claim 25

Deitz does not teach providing an audit trail of the user input.

Jayaram teaches providing an audit trail of the user input. (**Jayaram,** C21:34-52; 'Providing an audit trail' of applicant is disclosed by 'tracking are published through a report' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by outputting the audit trail as taught by Jayaram to providing an audit trail of the user input.

For the purpose of displaying the cost of the translation to the user so that the user can use this information to avoid audit trail costs thresholds.

Claim 26

Deitz does not teach repeating said applying activity.

Jayaram teaches repeating said applying activity. (**Jayaram,** Figure 9;
'Repeating said applying activity' of applicant is equivalent to the 'fail' arrow from
'business requirement compliance check' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a
person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the
teachings of Deitz by allowing to repeat steps as taught by Jayaram to repeating said
applying activity.

For the purpose of repeating a step if required so that a desired result can occur.

Claim 27

Deitz does not teach repeating said transforming activity.

Jayaram teaches repeating said transforming activity. (**Jayaram,** Figure 9;
'Repeating said transforming activity' of applicant is equivalent to 'the 'fail' arrow from
the 'database attribute compliance check' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a
person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the
teachings of Deitz by being able to repeat a transformation as taught by Jayaram to
repeating said transforming activity.

For the purpose of employing an iteration technique for a desired result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as

set forth above, in view of Payson. (U. S. Patent 6289266, referred to as **Payson**)

Claim 5

Deitz does not teach importing the first transformed version into the destination

system, the first transformed version obtained from a Bailey INFI-90 configuration

database.

Payson teaches importing the first transformed version into the destination

system, the first transformed version obtained from a Bailey INFI-90 configuration

database. (**Payson,** C5:1-5; 'Bailey INFI-90' of applicant is equivalent to 'INFI 90

available from Bailey' of Payson.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Deitz by using hardware as taught by Payson to importing the first transformed version

into the destination system, the first transformed version obtained from a Bailey INFI-90

configuration database.

For the purpose of using established hardware with proved results and

compatibility history.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as

set forth above, in view of Talanis. (U. S. Patent Publication 20010047420, referred to

as **Talanis**)

Claim 6

Deitz does not teach importing the second transformed version into the destination system the second transformed version comprising configuration elements associated with a WinCC operator console.

Talanis teaches importing the second transformed version into the destination system the second transformed version comprising configuration elements associated with a WinCC operator console. (**Talanis**, ¶0013; 'WinCC' of applicant is equivalent to 'WinCC' of Talanis.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using WinCC as taught by Talanis to have importing the second transformed version into the destination system the second transformed version comprising configuration elements associated with a WinCC operator console.

For the purpose of using an established software package as WinCC for importing transforms versions with known reliability and results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Mylopoulos. ('Knowbel: A Hybrid tool for building expert systems', referred to as **Mylopoulos**)

Claim 7

Deitz does not teach parsing the information, the information obtained from an APACS control system configuration database.

Mylopoulos teaches parsing the information, the information obtained from an APACS control system configuration database. (**Mylopoulos,** p22, C2:8 through p23, C1:51) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using APACS as taught by Mylopoulos to have parsing the information, the information obtained from an APACS control system configuration database.

For the purpose of using established hardware with known reliability and performance for obtaining accurate results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

Claims 9-11, 13, 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Moore. (U. S. Patent Publication 20010056429,

referred to as **Moore**)

Claim 9

Deitz does not teach applying XSLT transforms to the information.

Moore teaches applying XSLT transforms to the information. (**Moore, ¶0291**;

'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore.)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by introducing XSLT as taught by

Moore to apply XSLT transforms to the information.

For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for

obtaining reliable results.

Claim 10

Deitz does not teach applying XSLT transforms to the information and generating DHTML.

Moore teaches applying XSLT transforms to the information and generating DHTML. (**Moore,** ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore. 'Generating DHTML' of applicant is equivalent to using as a presentation language of DHTML of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by applying XSLT to DHTML as taught by Moore to apply XSLT transforms to the information and generating DHTML.

For the purpose of generating a interface which a user can interact with.

Claim 11

Deitz does not teach generating DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

Moore teaches generating DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Moore,** ¶0291; 'Generating DHTML' of applicant is equivalent to using as a presentation language of DHTML of Moore. A 'presentation language' of Moore is equivalent to 'translating an element of the information' of applicant.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using DHTML abilities as taught by Moore to generate DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

For the purpose of having a dynamic interface so the user can input translation requests.

Claim 13

Deitz does not teach interpreting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information using DHTML logic.

Moore teaches interpreting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information using DHTML logic. (**Moore,** ¶0291; 'Interpreting' of applicant is the presentation language function.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using DHTML as taught by Moore to interpreting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information using DHTML logic.

For the purpose of using logic to provide accurate results obtained from the use of established software as DHTML logic.

Claim 35

Deitz does not teach wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information.

Moore teaches wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information. (**Moore,** ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using XSLT as taught by Moore to have wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information.

For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for obtaining reliable results in translation tasks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of the combination of Koizumi and Jayaram. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi**; U. S. Patent 6996589, referred to as **Jayaram**)

Claim 16

Deitz does not teach presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Koizumi teaches presenting to each of a plurality of users. (**Koizumi, ¶0380**; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program to the

users of Koizumi.) Jayaram teaches a plurality of options adapted for use in translation

of an element of the information. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47; 'Plurality of options' of applicant

is equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings

of Deitz by presenting multiple options to multiple users as taught by Koizumi and

Jayaram to presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for

use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of dividing the work tasks into different sections for increased

productivity per time.

Claim 17

Deitz does not teach presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of

options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information, the plurality of

options and the information element differing for each of the plurality of users.

Koizumi teaches presenting to each of a plurality of users. (**Koizumi,** ¶0380;

'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program to the

users of Koizumi.) Jayaram teaches a plurality of options adapted for use in translation

of an element of the information, the plurality of options and the information element

differing for each of the plurality of users. (**Jayaram,** C13:1-47, abstract; 'Presenting a

plurality of options of applicant is equivalent to 'constructs in a selectable list' of

Jayaram. 'Translating an element' of applicant is disclosed by the 'database conversion

engine' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the

art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by presenting

multiple options of translations to multiple users as taught by Koizumi and Jayaram to

presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for use in

translation of an element of the information, the plurality of options and the information

element differing for each of the plurality of users.

For the purpose of obtaining different translations for different users, such that

user specialization can be utilized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

Claims 21, 28-33, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Nixon. (U. S. Patent Publication

20020077711, referred to as **Nixon**)

Claim 21

Deitz does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Nixon teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Plurality of users' of Nixon is equivalent to 'one or more users' of Nixon. 'Receiving input from each of a plurality of users' of applicant is equivalent to 'each user interface routine can receive' of Nixon. 'Preference adapted for use in translation' of applicant is equivalent to 'information from the asset utilization suite' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by inputting multiple users translation request as taught by Nixon to receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of a multiple of users being able to input data so that each user can receive outputs from their specific requests.

Claim 28

Deitz does not teach providing a view of the destination system.

Nixon teaches comprising providing a view of the destination system. (**Nixon,** ¶0125; 'Providing a view' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical views' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by providing output as taught by

Nixon to have a view of the destination system.

For the purpose of seeing the interface of the system and the results of the

translation which are imposed on the destination system.

Claim 29

Deitz does not teach providing a plurality of differing views of the destination

system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for the

destination system.

Nixon teaches providing a plurality of differing views of the destination system,

each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for the destination

system. (**Nixon,** ¶0125; 'Plurality of differing views' of applicant is equivalent to 'one or

more pull down menus' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Deitz by providing multiple views as taught by Nixon to have a plurality of differing views

of the destination system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a

different use for the destination system.

For the purpose of each user having their own view, due to the logic it would

hinder the user to see results of other views which are of no concern to the user.

Claim 30

Deitz does not teach presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version.

Nixon teaches presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0125, ¶0048; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using GUI interface as taught by Nixon to have in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version.

For the purpose of using a GUI which allows for increase of ease of use for the user.

Claim 31

Deitz does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Nixon teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Plurality of users' of Nixon is equivalent to 'one or more users' of Nixon. 'Receiving input from each of a plurality of users' of applicant is equivalent to 'each user interface routine can receive' of Nixon. 'Preference adapted for use in translation' of applicant is equivalent to 'information from the asset utilization suite' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having multiple users input e allowed as

taught by Nixon to have receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of allowing the user to dictate translation needs thus permitting the user to focus in on specific translation elements.

Claim 32

Deitz does not teach wherein the second transformed version is based on the first transformed version.

Nixon teaches wherein the second transformed version is based on the first transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0088; 'Second transformed version based on the first' of applicant can be seen as the 'hierarchy represents' of a user.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by altering an existing interface as taught by Nixon to have the second transformed version is based on the first transformed version.

For the purpose of updating an interface for greater or lesser content for increased accuracy of field of use.

Claim 33

Deitz does not teach wherein the second transformed version is not based on the first transformed version.

Nixon teaches wherein the second transformed version is not based on the first

transformed version. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Not based on the first transform' of applicant is

equivalent to 'different sets' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Deitz by generating a new interface as taught by Nixon to have the second transformed

version is not based on the first transformed version.

For the purpose of looking at a completely different interface if needed to observe

different scenarios for other solutions which are outside a specific domain.

Claim 36

Deitz does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set.

(**Nixon,** ¶0048; 'Patterns is a set' of applicant is disclosed by 'different sets' of Nixon.) It

would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having information in a set as

taught by Nixon to have at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set.

For the purpose of using set theory in a abstract way to reduce input parameters

or established scenarios for greater efficiency.

Claim 37

Deitz does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a

hierarchy.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a hierarchy. (**Nixon,** ¶0088; 'Patterns is a hierarchy' of applicant can be seen as the 'hierarchy represents' of a user.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having a hierarchy structure in patterns as taught by Nixon to have wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a hierarchy.

For the purpose of looking at hierarchy patterns related in a processing structure for increased understanding of an overall pattern.

Claim 38

Deitz does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming convention.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming convention. (**Nixon,** Fig. 8; "naming convention' of applicant is illustrated by the examples of 'Mixing-reagent1', 'Mixer-in1', 'Mixer-reagent2', 'Mixer-in2', 'Mixer-feed', 'Mixer-in', ''Static mixer' and 'Mixer-out' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using naming conventions as taught by Nixon to have at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming convention.

For the purpose of ease of search based on the name of patterns.

Claim 39

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user

and input from a second user.

Nixon teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and

input from a second user. (**Nixon,** ¶0048; Nixon discloses that one or more users can

subscribe to the same or different sets of data.) It would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings

of Deitz by having multiple users work on each other's input as taught by Nixon to have

wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second

user.

For the purpose of being to modify each other work for improved results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as

set forth above, in view the combination of Koizumi and Betawar. (U. S. Patent

Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi;** U. S. Patent Publication

20020055804, referred to as **Betawar**)

Claim 22

Deitz does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding

each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's

preference overriding a second user's preference.

Koizumi teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users (**Koizumi,**

¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program

to the users of Koizumi.) Betawar teaches regarding each user's preference for

translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second

user's preference. (**Betawar, ¶0057**; In this example, 'First user' of applicant is

equivalent to 'engineering supervisors of Betawar. Second user of applicant is

equivalent to 'lower level line engineers'.) It would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings

of Deitz by having multiple users in which one user can override another input as taught

by Koizumi and Betawar to receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding

each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's

preference overriding a second user's preference.

For the purpose of having more than one person being able to override a

preference for increased accuracy or prevention of an error.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as

set forth above, in view of Koizumi. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020026633, referred to

as **Koizumi**)

Claim 34

Deitz does not teach wherein a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of

pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least one

known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of

knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information.

Koizumi teaches wherein a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of pattern

matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least one known

relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of

knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information. (**Koizumi; ¶0054;**

'Pattern matching rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'translation rules' of Koizumi.

'Knowledge elements' and 'known relationship' of applicant is illustrated by the function

of the ARM (abstract register machine) of Koizumi.) It would have been obvious to a

person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the

teachings of Deitz by using rules based on knowledge elements as taught by Koizumi to

a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of pattern matching rules is based on a

plurality of knowledge elements and at least one known relationship between the

plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of knowledge elements identifiable

as an entity in the information.

For the purpose of using rules that follow elements and there relationship

between them which aids in viewing patterns as clusters (or relationships) and thus

using rules only associated with a specific cluster (or relationship) and the associated

efficiency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view Betawar. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020055804, referred to as **Betawar**)

Claim 40

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user. (**Betawar, ¶0057**; 'First user' of applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers' of Betawar. 'Input is derived' and 'input from a second user' of applicant is illustrated by the supervisor being able to edit parameters.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by users having different authority positions as taught by Betawar to wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user.

For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated within the specification for increased accuracy.

Claim 41

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user. (**Betawar,** ¶0057; 'Different position' of applicant is equivalent to the difference 'lower level line engineers' and 'engineering supervisors' of Betawar.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having users at different authority levels as taught by Betawar to have wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user.

For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated in a business setting within the specification for increased profits.

Claim 42

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user

and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user

altering at least a portion of the input from the first user. (**Betawar,** ¶0057; 'First user' of

applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers' of Betawar. 'Input is derived' and

'input from a second user' of applicant is illustrated by the supervisor being able to edit

parameters.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having the

supervisor being able to alter input of another user as taught by Betawar to have

wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second

user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the

input from the first user.

For the purpose of the supervisor or making changes on lower level users input

for modification or alteration for increased accuracy.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on May 30, 2008 for claims 1-44 have been fully

considered but are not persuasive.

8.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Regarding p10 and enablement rejections.

Examiner's response:

The Examiner withdraws the rejection based on the amended claims.

9.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Regarding p10-11 section II 'anticipation rejections'

Examiner's response:

Deitz is no longer used as a reference for the independent claims. Deitz is used

for the independent claims.   'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of

applicant is equivalent to 'batch oriented process control systems including for example

process control systems that produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz. (**Deitz,** C5:17-46;);

'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of applicant is illustrated by 'received a

second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message

requesting … using a graphical user interface and prompts a user to enter a first input

identifying a subset of set of batch information from the displayed set of batch

information from the displayed set of batch information to be included within at least one

batch of the plurality of batches' of Deitz. (**Deitz,** C4:9-32); 'First transformed version of

the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of

the configuration information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of Deitz. (**Deitz,** Fig.

9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10) 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the

classical definition of 'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages

which enable web pages to be dynamic. Thus since Deitz is able to be edited and be

used over the internet, then DHTML is inherent. (**Deitz,** C1:36-50, C16:46-54)

'Expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is

disclosed by the ability to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz. (**Deitz,** C8:28-55;)

Office Action stands.

10.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

        Concerning p11 through p17 in light of KSR International Co. vs Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. , 127 S. Ct. 1727, 2007 U.S. Lexis 4745 (2007). The applicant emphases 'a
reason that would have prompted' a person of ordinary skill in the art to make such a
combination.

Examiner's response:

        All claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 have stated reasons to combine references.

Office Action stands.

11.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

        Concerning p18 through p22.

Examiner's response:

        Claim 2 states 'For the purpose of avoiding additional computing cost associated

with two or more formats.' Claim 3 states 'For the purpose of having the invention

easier to use for the user due to the fact the user defines syntax is employed.' Claim 4

states 'For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of implementation across multiple platforms.'

12.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p22-23.

Examiner's response:

Claim 5 states using a Bailey INFI-90 database. (**Payson,** C5:1-5; 'Bailey INFI-90' of applicant is equivalent to 'INFI 90 available from Bailey' of Payson.) Applicant arguments that 'importing' information is not stated within a database, due to the fact that it is inherent that information can be 'imported into a database. 'First transformed version' is addresses within the independent claim. 'Destination system' is information going to the database. 'Configuration database' is the database itself. Office Action stands.

13.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p23-25.

Examiner's response:

Claim 6 uses an WinCC operator console. 'WinCC' of applicant is

equivalent to 'WinCC' of Talanis. (**Talanis,** ¶0013) Applicant arguments that 'importing'

information is not stated within a database, due to the fact that it is inherent that

information can be 'imported into a database. 'Second transformed version' is

addresses within the independent claim. . 'Destination system' is information going to

the database. 'Configuration database' is the database itself. Office Action stands.

14.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p25-59

Examiner's response:

Claim 7 states 'For the purpose of using established hardware with known

reliability and performance for obtaining accurate results.' Claim 8 states 'For the

purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of expression across multiple

platforms.' Claim 9 states 'For the purpose of using standard information technologies

such as XSLT for obtaining reliable results.' Claim 10 states 'For the purpose of

generating a interface which a user can interact with.' Claim 11 states 'For the purpose

of having a dynamic interface so the user can input translation requests.' Claim 12

states 'For the purpose of being able to generate options for obtaining different

translations as needed.' Claim 13 states 'For the purpose of using logic to provide

accurate results obtained from the use of established software as DHTML logic.' Claim

14 states 'For the purpose of being able to view the possible options to use for

translation functions.' Claim 15 states 'For the purpose of being able to employ the

possible options to use for translation functions.' Claim 16 states 'For the purpose of

dividing the work tasks into different sections for increased productivity per time.' Claim

17 states 'For the purpose of obtaining different translations for different users, such

that user specialization can be utilized.' Claim 18 states 'For the purpose of reducing the

effort to employ the options by using a GUI.' Claim 19 states 'For the purpose of having

the invention take in input from the user so that the user can chose which translation

options are desired.' Claim 21 states 'For the purpose of a multiple of users being able

to input data so that each user can receive outputs from their specific requests.' Claim

22 states 'For the purpose of having more than one person being able to override a

preference for increased accuracy or prevention of an error.' Claim 23 states 'For the

purpose of aiding the user by avoiding duplicate translation request.' Claim 24 states

'For the purpose of keeping track of the cost for the translations of the invention for

possible display to the user.' Claim 25 states 'For the purpose of displaying the cost of

the translation to the user so that the user can use this information to avoid audit trail

costs thresholds.' Claim 26 states 'For the purpose of repeating a step if required so

that a desired result can occur.' Claim 27 states 'For the purpose of employing an

iteration technique for a desired result.' Claim 28 states 'For the purpose of seeing the

interface of the system and the results of the translation which are imposed on the

destination system.' Claim 29 states 'For the purpose of each user having their own

view, due to the logic it would hinder the user to see results of other views which are of

no concern to the user.' Claim 30 states 'For the purpose of using a GUI which allows

for increase of ease of use for the user.' Claim 31 states 'For the purpose of allowing

the user to dictate translation needs thus permitting the user to focus in on specific

translation elements.' Claim 32 states 'For the purpose of updating an interface for

greater or lesser content for increased accuracy of field of use.' Claim 33 states 'For the

purpose of looking at a completely different interface if needed to observe different

scenarios for other solutions which are outside a specific domain.' Claim 34 states 'For

the purpose of using rules that follow elements and there relationship between them

which aids in viewing patterns as clusters (or relationships) and thus using rules only

associated with a specific cluster (or relationship) and the associated efficiency.' Claim

35 states 'For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for

obtaining reliable results in translation tasks.' Claim 36 states 'For the purpose of using

set theory in a abstract way to reduce input parameters or established scenarios for

greater efficiency.' Claim 37 states 'For the purpose of looking at hierarchy patterns

related in a processing structure for increased understanding of an overall pattern.'

Claim 38 states 'For the purpose of ease of search based on the name of patterns.'

Claim 39 states 'For the purpose of being to modify each other work for improved

results.' Claim 40 states 'For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated

within the specification for increased accuracy.' Claim 41 states 'For the purpose of

having the role of supervisor incorporated in a business setting within the specification

for increased profits.' Claim 42 states 'For the purpose of the supervisor or making

changes on lower level users input for modification or alteration for increased accuracy.'

All these statements are reasons to combine the references of the dependent claims to

the single reference of the independent claims. Office Action stands.

15.   In reference to the Applicant's argument:

       Regarding p59-61

Examiner's response:

       This claim is restricted due to the different domain then that of claims 1-44. Office

Action stands.

Examination Considerations

16.   The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention.

"Office personnel are to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light

of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023,

1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in

the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d, 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ

541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, l 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, l 1-4). The

Examiner has the full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the

art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in

meaning.

17.   Examiner's Notes are provided to assist the applicant to better understand the

nature of the prior art, application of such prior art and, as appropriate, to further

indicate other prior art that maybe applied in other office actions. Such comments are

entirely consistent with the intent and sprit of compact prosecution. However, and

unless otherwise stated, the Examiner's Notes are not prior art but link to prior art that

one of ordinary skill in the art would find inherently appropriate.

18.   Examiner's Opinion: Paragraphs 16 and 17 apply. The Examiner has full

latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

Conclusion

19.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

20.   Claims 1-44 are rejected.

        Claim 45 is restricted.

Correspondence Information

21.   Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should

be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45

p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3080. Any response to this

office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,

Customer Service Window,

Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street,

Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:

(571) 272-3150 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions

on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

866-217-9197 (toll free).

/P. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2129

Peter Coughlan

6/16/2008

/David R Vincent/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2129